



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,170	03/19/2004	Marc David Abrahams	81101/7114	7393
37123 7590 04/17/2008 FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LASALLE SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603			EXAMINER SHU, HO T	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/805,170

**Applicant(s)**

ABRAHAM ET AL.

**Examiner**

HO SHIU

**Art Unit**

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 14-20 are newly presented. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

#### ***Specification***

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Claim 17 recites "the user information includes a name, address and phone number" But there is no antecedent basis for the claimed term "name" dealing with customer information within the original specification.

#### ***Claim Objections***

3. With respect to claims 15 and 16, it seems that they are the same claims repeated of each other. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim includes the limitation wherein "the user information includes a name, address and phone number" and the Applicant's amendment points to page 6, lines 16-19 in the original specification as providing support for the limitation. However, the cited paragraphs refer specifically to customer information such as their address and phone number. No where in the paragraphs of Applicant's specification state "name" as customer information. Consequently, Examiner considers Applicant was not in possession of the claimed invention at the time of the filing date.

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 19 recites "a business network link". It does not define what a business network link is. For examination purposes, a business network link is treated as a network where business takes place.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

- a. A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
- b. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.

11. **Claims 1, 2, 9-13, 15-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Broadhurst et al. (US Patent # 6,205,480 B1, hereinafter Broadhurst).**

12. With respect to claim 1, Broadhurst discloses: a method for computer network access comprising the steps of: communicating user information to a first server from a client (column 2, lines 33-36); storing user information on the first server (column 3, lines 42-44, lines 12-14); creating a unique identification for the user (column 4, lines 20-22); storing the unique identification on the first server (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14); communicating the unique identification to the client and other servers (columns 3, lines 42-52, lines 12-14); storing the unique identification on the client and other servers (column 3, lines 42-52, lines 12-14); and matching the unique identification stored on the client to that stored either on the first or other servers when the user correspondingly communicates with either the first or other servers (column 4, lines 20-

23, column 2, lines 33-36, column 3, lines 48-52).

13. With respect to claim 2, Broadhurst discloses where in the other servers correspond to particular services available to the user and wherein the user is not allowed access to the services if the matching step is unsuccessful (column 3, Lines 46-48).

14. With respect to claim 9, Broadhurst discloses a digital computer system programmed to perform the following steps: communicating user information to a first server from a client (column 2, lines 33-36); storing user information on the first server (column 3, lines 42-44, lines 12-14); creating a unique identification for the user (column 4, lines 20-22); storing the unique identification on the first server (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14); communicating the unique identification to the client and other servers (column 3, lines 42-52, lines 12-14); storing the unique identification on the client and other servers (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14); and matching the unique identification stored on the client to that stored either on the first or other servers when the user correspondingly communicates with either the first or other servers (column 4, lines 20-23, column 2, lines 33-36, lines 48-52) wherein the other servers correspond to particular services available to the user (column 3, lines 46-48) and wherein the user is not allowed access to the services if the matching step is unsuccessful (column 3, lines 46-48).

15. With respect to claim 10, Broadhurst discloses a computer-readable medium storing a computer program implementing a method comprising the steps of: communicating user information to a first server from a client (column 2, lines 33-36); storing user information on the first server (column 3, lines 42-44, lines 12-14); creating a unique identification for the user (column 4, lines 20-22); storing the unique identification on the first server (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14); communicating the unique identification to the client and other servers (column 3, lines 42-52, lines 12-14); storing the unique identification on the client and other servers (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14); and matching the unique identification stored on the client to that stored either on the first or other servers when the user correspondingly communicates with either the first or other servers (column 4, lines 20-23, column 2, lines 33-36, lines 48-52) wherein the other servers correspond to particular services available to the user (column 3, lines 46-48) and wherein the user is not allowed access to the services if the matching step is unsuccessful (column 3, lines 46-48).

16. With respect to claim 11, Broadhurst discloses a computer network system comprising: a server computer running a server software application operable for creating a unique identification for a user (column 4, lines 20-22, column 2, lines 33-36), storing the unique identification on the server computer (column 3, lines 42-45, lines 12-14), communicating the unique identification to a client (column 3, lines 42-48, lines 19-21,) and authenticating the user via the unique identification when the user communicates

with the server computer (column 4, lines 20-23); and a client computer running a client software application (column 2, lines 33-36, column 3, lines 19-21), said client computer operably connected to the server computer over a network and wherein the client software application is operable for communicating user information to the server application software from the client computer (column 2, lines 33-36, column 3, lines 19-21, lines 29-31) , storing user information on the client computer (column 3, lines 42-45), and performing the user authentication with the server application (column 4, lines 20-23, col. 3, lines 42-48).

17. With respect to claim 12, Broadhurst discloses at least one additional server software application running on the server computer operable for providing information services to a user and is operable for receiving the unique user identification from the server computer and authenticating the user via the unique identification when the user communicates with the additional server software applications (column 3, lines 49-52, col. 3, lines 42-48).

18. With respect to claim 13, Broadhurst discloses at least one additional server computer running an additional server software application, said additional server computer operable connected to the server computer and client computer over a network and operable for providing information services to a user, receiving the unique user identification from the server computer and authenticating the user via the unique identification when the user communicates with the additional server software



Art Unit: 2157

application (column 3, lines 49-52, col. 3, lines 42-48).

19. With respect to claims 15 and 16, Broadhurst discloses wherein in the step of communicating the unique identification to the client and other servers the unique identification is not embedded in a cookie (col. 2, lines 32-35, col. 3, lines 41-44).

20. With respect to claim 19, Broadhurst discloses wherein the at least one additional server computer running is operably connected to the server computer through a business network link (col. 2, lines 6-9).

21. With respect to claim 20, Broadhurst discloses further comprising a firewall between the one server computer and the client computer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**23. Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst as applied to claim 1 in view of Grantges, Jr. (US Patent 6,324,648 B1, hereinafter Grantges).**

24. With respect to claim 3, Broadhurst discloses the claimed invention except that the method of claim 1 wherein the communicating user information step comprises employing common gateway interface standard.

In the same field of endeavor, Grantges clearly discloses a web server communicates with the information collector using the well-known Gateway Interface (CGI), the specification for transferring information between a web server and CGI program (column 1, line 67, column 2, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that you would use CGI interface to communicate information to a web server in order to interface external application software with an information server which allows the server to pass requests from a client web browser to the external application in a more efficient manner.

25. With respect to claim 6, Broadhurst discloses the claimed invention except that the method of claim 1 wherein the communicating the user information step comprises employing common gateway interface standard.

In the same field of endeavor, Grantges clearly discloses a web server communicates with the information collector using the well-known Gateway Interface

(CGI), the specification for transferring information between a web server and CGI program (column 1, line 67, column 2, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that you would use CGI interface to communicate information to a web server in order to interface external application software with an information server which allows the server to pass requests from a client web browser to the external application in a more efficient manner.

**26. Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst as applied to claim 1 in view of Heimsoth et al. (US Patent 5,764,915, hereinafter Heimsoth).**

27. With respect to claim 5, Broadhurst discloses the claimed invention except that the method of claim 1 wherein the communicating user information step comprises employing Berkeley System Distribution socket interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Heimsoth clearly discloses the process which an application needs to access the TCP/IP protocol is a communications API layer such as a BSD sockets interface (column 13, lines 25-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Heimsoth teachings with the teachings of Broadhurst, in order for information from an application to communicate to a TCP/IP protocol that is embedded in every server through BSD sockets [see

Heimsoth, Col. 13, lines 25-29]. The motivation to do so, is stated within Broadhurst where it he discloses the desire to allow access regardless of whether the applications are operating in the same or different environments [see Broadhurst, Col. 2, lines 19-24].

28. With respect to claim 8, Broadhurst discloses the claimed invention except that the method of claim 1 wherein the communicating the unique identification step comprises employing Berkeley System Distribution socket interface.

In the same field of endeavor, Heimsoth clearly discloses the process which an application needs to access the TCP/IP protocol is a communications API layer such as a BSD sockets interface (column 13, lines 25-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Heimsoth teachings with the teachings of Broadhurst, in order for information from an application to communicate to a TCP/IP protocol that is embedded in every server through BSD sockets [see Heimsoth, Col. 13, lines 25-29]. The motivation to do so, is stated within Broadhurst where it he discloses the desire to allow access regardless of whether the applications are operating in the same or different environments [see Broadhurst, Col. 2, lines 19-24].

29. **Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst as applied to claim 1 in view of Lerner (Pub # US 2002/0010776**

**A1, hereinafter Lerner).**

30. With respect to claim 4, Broadhurst discloses the claimed invention except that the method of claim 1 wherein the communicating user information step comprises employing JAVA servlet technology.

In the same field of endeavor, Lerner clearly discloses that when any web application in the same central server domain name may be subsequently read the cookie when the browser is directed to a webpage, a CGI script or a java servlet located on that server. (paragraph 0037, lines 8-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that employing JAVA servlet technology would be advised so servlets can maintain state across many server transactions by using HTTP cookies, session variables or URL writing.

31. With respect to claim 7, it is being rejected for the same reasons as claim 4 above.

**32. Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst as applied to claim 1 in view of Fukuda et al., (US Pub# 2002/0184539 A1, hereinafter Fukuda).**

33. With respect to claim 14, Broadhurst does not disclose the step of creating a unique identification for the user includes generating a random number.

In the same field of endeavor, Fukuda discloses the step of creating a unique identification for the user includes generating a random number ([0009], lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Broadhurst with the teachings of Fukuda in order for an authentication key to possess a unique version of the program to allow generation of a specific two-dimensional code for highly accurate user authentication ([0008]).

34. With respect to claim 17, Broadhurst does not disclose the step of communicating user information to a first server from a client the user information includes a name, address and phone number.

In the same field of endeavor, Fukuda discloses the step of communicating user information to a first server from a client the user information includes a name, address and phone number ([0051], lines 1-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Broadhurst with the

teachings of Fukuda in order to know who the authentication code belongs to and if they are registered users ([0052]).

**35. Claims 15, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadhurst as applied to claim 1 in view of Bertani et al., (US Patent # 7,093,019 B1, hereinafter Bertani).**

36. With respect to claims 15 and 16, it is further rejected by Bertani. Bertani discloses wherein in the step of communicating the unique identification to the client and other servers the unique identification is not embedded in a cookie (col. 6, lines 46-54).

37. With respect to claim 18, Broadhurst does not disclose wherein the client software application does not store cookies.

In the same field of endeavor, Bertani discloses wherein the client software application does not store cookies (col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 2, lines 1-2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Broadhurst with the teachings of Bertani in order to provide registration information or a personal identifier in case consumers attempt to block the storage of cookies on their computers or disable cookies already stored there (col. 1, lines 60-64).

***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicant's arguments, with regards to claims 1-13, filed 01/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

39. On page 7 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, and 10, applicants argue that Broadhurst does not disclose or suggests matching a unique ID stored on the client to that stored either on the first or other server.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because Broadhurst discloses "In step 104, it is determined whether the user already has a cookie containing a network credential. If there is not yet a user cookie, one is created in step 106 (col. 4, lines 20-23)." Therefore, Broadhurst discloses that a determination/matching step is utilized to recognize if a user already has a cookie (a unique ID). Even though Broadhurst stores cookies in a server and has cookies readily available, it does not mean that a matching step is being omitted. In fact, Broadhurst makes sure that every user has a cookie by determining/matching the user to an already available cookie in order to conclude if a cookie exists for each particular user. If a cookie is not identified by not being able to determine/match an existing cookie to a particular user, a new cookie will be created so that it will be able to determine/match a cookie that is distributed in accordance to the user information at a later point.



40. On page 8 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 11-13, applicants also argue that Broadhurst does not disclose or suggests authenticating the user via a unique ID.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments, because Broadhurst discloses "For each user, the directory 16 stores information which allows the user's authentication information to be mapped into a network credential which includes a role of the user. The network credential can then be formed into a cookie. Once logged in and initially authenticated to the network, a user may freely access any of the applications allowed by the role (col. 3, lines 42-48)." Broadhurst, col. 3, lines 42-48 was introduced as a citation for claim 11. In further view, on page 7 of the Applicant's Response, Applicants note that there is an authentication procedure as taught by Broadhurst.

41. On page 9 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 3 and 6 applicants also argue that they are patentable over Broadhurst in view of Grantges since Broadhurst fails to disclose "Matching the unique identification.....with either the first or other servers."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. Broadhurst discloses matching a unique user ID as explained with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, and 10.

42. On page 9 and 10 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 5 and 8 applicants also argue that they are patentable over Broadhurst in view of Heimsoth

since Broadhurst fails to disclose "Matching the unique identification.....with either the first or other servers."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. Broadhurst discloses matching a unique user ID as explained with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, and 10.

43. On page 10 of the Applicant's Response, with respect to claims 4 and 7 applicants also argue that they are patentable over Broadhurst in view of Lerner since Broadhurst fails to disclose "Matching the unique identification.....with either the first or other servers."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments. Broadhurst discloses matching a unique user ID as explained with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, and 10.

### ***Conclusion***

44. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is (571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS

/Salad Abdullahi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2157

04/08/2008

